foundation in the prerogative of the Crown, flowing from its general power and duty as *parens patriae* to protect all those who have no one to look after them. Under these circumstances, I feel sure I shall be deemed to have made out a case for legislation, if I simply state that in Travancore we have as yet no law on the subject.

As regards the main features of the Bill, I need only say they are the same as those in Act No. VIII of 1890 which is the law on the subject in British India. A few slight changes here and there, rendered necessary by the peculiarities of our country, have however been introduced. What they are and why I have brought them in will be explained at a later stage, whether a case for legislation has been made out being all we are concerned with at present.

Permission was granted accordingly.

CIVIL PROCEDURE CODE AMENDMENT BILL.

Mr. Thanu Pillai.—At the last meeting of the Council I asked for and obtained permission to introduce a Bill to amend the Code of Civil Procedure and in pursuance of that permission I now beg to introduce the Bill. The main provisions of the Bill have been explained in the Statement of Objects and Reasons; and I do not think I need make any further observations at this stage. I would therefore under para 33 of the Council Rules move that the Bill be read in Council.

The principle of the Bill having been affirmed, Mr. Thanu Pillai proposed that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee consisting of Messrs. Prince, Ramier, Kochukrishna Marar and the Mover, to report within three months.

Seconded by Mr. Kuruvila.

Carried.

ABKARI REGULATION AMENDMENT BILL.

Mr. Thanu Pillai.—The Bill has been already published in the Gazette under Rule 32, but the period of fifteen days mentioned in Rule 33 not having elapsed, I beg in the first place to move under Rule 66 that the latter part of Rule 33 be suspended.

The Council having suspended the Rule as applied for, Mr. Thanu Pillai introduced the Bill and in doing so observed:—

"The Bill contains only one section. The Council will perhaps remember that in the original Bill of which I was in charge and which became law as Regulation IV of 1073, there was a first para to section 61. That para was taken from the corresponding section of the Madras Abkari Act (I of 1886) and introduced a special rule of presumption in prosecutions under the Abkari Regulation. The Select Committee on the Bill thought that the necessity for such a statutory presumption was not quite apparent and omitted the provision. The Regulation has been in force for some time and it has been brought to the notice of Government that the absence of the provision renders it difficult to enforce the Regulation criminally, and that any failure of the law to deal with Abkari offences would not only affect the revenue of this State, but also re-act on the neighbouring territories and facilitate smuggling. I may here point out that such a legal presumption is provided for in almost every Revenue Regulation here and in British India. I would refer you to section 7 of the Opium and Bhang Regulation (VI of 1063) and section 52 of the Forest Regulation (II of 1068), and it does not appear that the rule has in any case worked practical hardship. I beg therefore to move that the Bill be read in Council and its principle affirmed."

After some discussion the principle of the Bill was affirmed.

Mr. Thanu Pillai.—I do not think this Bill need go before a Select Committee. I beg to move that Rule 45 be suspended and the Bill be taken up for consideration by the Council at once.

The Council accordingly suspended the Rule and proceeded to the consideration of the Bill. No amendments having been proposed, Mr. Thanu Pillai moved under Rule 50, first para, that the Bill be taken up and passed at a subsequent meeting of which notice shall be given.

Seconded by Mr. Prince.

Carried.

The Council adjourned at 2-30 P. M.

K. KRISHNASWAMY RAO,

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly